



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,980	03/22/2004	Yin L. Cheung	33849-8	2205
36993	7590	10/14/2010		
CRAIN, CATON & JAMES FIVE HOUSTON CENTER 1401 MCKINNEY, 17TH FLOOR HOUSTON, TX 77010			EXAMINER NGUYEN, PHU K	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/14/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

wjensen@craincaton.com

jHUDSON@craincaton.com

ipdocket@craincaton.com

RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte YIN L. CHEUNG, MICHAEL J. ZEITLIN,
and MARK ACOSTA

Appeal 2009-013338
Application 10/806,980
Technology Center 2600

Oral Hearing Held: July 14, 2010

Before KENNETH W. HAIRSTON, MAHSHID D. SAADAT, and
BRADLEY W. BAUMEISTER, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

APPEARANCES:

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

WILLIAM P. JENSEN, ESQUIRE
Crain, Caton, & James
1401 McKinney Street
Seventeenth Floor
Five Houston Center
Houston, Texas 77010-4035
(713) 658-2323

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Wednesday, July
2 14, 2010, commencing at 9:05 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark
3 Office, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Janice Salas, Notary
4 Public.

5 THE CLERK: Calendar number 7, appeal number 2009-013338,
6 Mr. Jensen.

7 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Thank you.

8 Good morning, Mr. Jensen.

9 MR. JENSEN: Good morning.

10 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Do you have your business card --

11 MR. JENSEN: Yes, sir.

12 JUDGE HAIRSTON: -- for the record.

13 Spell your name for the record correctly.

14 MR. JENSEN: William Jensen.

15 JUDGE HAIRSTON: No. I mean, your business card, if you have it, so she
16 can make sure get it correct.

17 MR. JENSEN: There you go.

18 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Thank you.

19 MR. JENSEN: Again, my name is Bill Jensen. I'm representing the
20 Applicants this morning. I'm from the firm of Crain, Caton, and
21 James in Houston, Texas.

22 Before I begin, I've got a presentation that sort of summarizes our arguments
23 that I think will help in understanding of the invention and the prior art
24 better since it's a lot -- mostly related to the visual arts. My concern is I've
25 taken a trial run or two, and I think it takes about 20 minutes with the

1 anticipated questions. I might run over, and I understand we have to ask for
2 time -- extra time up-front.

3 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Okay. That's fine. Go ahead.

4 MR. JENSEN: I think the most logical starting point is with the interview
5 that was conducted on May 25th where an agreement was
6 reached with the examiner concerning some amendments to clarify --

7 JUDGE HAIRSTON: May 25th of this year?

8 MR. JENSEN: May 25th of 2007.

9 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Oh, okay. We have a rocket docket here.

10 MR. JENSEN: I understand. I'm familiar. This is a copy of the interview
11 summary. The agreement that was reached is pertaining to the clarification
12 of real time. The Examiner made some suggestion -- proposed some
13 suggested language, as you see here, for sufficiently fast to be perceived in
14 real time as the three-D probe is moved or substantially at the same time as
15 the three-D sampling probe is moved.

16 The claims were being rejected over a reference called Holden, which is a
17 user manual for some software called VoxelGeo in the market.

18 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Does your spec make clear what's sub -- what are the
19 parameters of substantially? How much time is involved,
20 substantially at the same time?

21 MR. JENSEN: Well, the description basically says that it -- it ties it into
22 interactive, meaning that it's being visualized or rendered at the same time as
23 it's being moved, so it all really boils back down to the real time reference
24 that the Examiner's pointed to here in the agreement that was reached.

25 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Okay.

1 MR. JENSEN: The Examiner had represented that the rejections be
2 withdrawn and the claims allowed if there was no other reference for the
3 related references that were found after a search was conducted. The next
4 event -- well, the next event that took place is we amended the claims
5 exactly as the Examiner suggested, as you can see by the -- this is an
6 exemplary claim wherein the amendments were entered.

7 The underlining represents the proposed language by the Examiner to
8 provide clarification of the operation of the sampling probe, and this, again,
9 is an exemplary claim where claim 1 includes this limitation and claim 27 is
10 an alternative of that showing sufficiently fast to be perceived in real time as
11 the three-D sampling probe is moved.

12 Backing up to the first step, what's happening here is that the sampling probe
13 in the first step is created and the sampling probe is a subset or a subvolume
14 of a larger three-D volume data set.

15 The three-D volume data set will typically represent seismic data that may
16 comprise a set of voxels, which are data points representing a point of data, a
17 fixed point, with X, Y, Z coordinates and a data value.

18 So what happens is the seismic data is typically shot into the earth. The
19 reflection bounces back, and the reflection is measured, for example, in
20 terms of the amplitude. The amplitude is represented as a voxel at that
21 particular point of reflection, and the data value represents the strength of the
22 amplitude reflection, which is a range of data values from zero to 256, for
23 example, and the data value can be represented as a color corresponding to
24 the amplitude and the strength of the reflection.

25 The next step that's performed is the drawing of the image of the three-D
26 sampling probe. The image is basically an intersection of the probe and the

1 larger three-D volume data set. The drawing, as the description refers to, is
2 typically done by either texture mapping the intersection of the seismic data
3 on the surfaces, the visible surfaces of the sampling probe, or the volume
4 rendering it where it's rendered both on the surfaces and throughout the
5 interior of the sampling probe.

6 And then I think what's at the heart of the disagreement with the Examiner is
7 the next step, the repeating the drawing step responsive to movement of the
8 three-D sampling probe within the three-D volume, so that as the three-D
9 sampling probe moves through the volume, the image of the sampling probe
10 is redrawn in one of these two manners.

11 So basically what's happening is that when you have the sampling probe
12 drawn with that intersection and you want to move it to another point in the
13 three-D volume, then the user is enabled to see the data changing on those
14 surfaces of the sampling probe as it's being moved from one point in the
15 volume to another point.

16 So, for example, if the user wanted to track a fault that's represented by the
17 seismic data, and the user is typically referred to as an interpreter of the
18 seismic data, the user positions the sampling probe in an area where he
19 thinks that the fault occurs and then he intuitively can move the sampling
20 probe through that larger data set, tracking the fault in real time to see
21 exactly where the parameters are on that fault.

22 This is a significant advancement over the technology at this time, as I'll get
23 into later when we compare it to the Holden reference. The next event that
24 took place, rather surprising I guess, is that the Examiner rejected in a final
25 rejection claims after we amended them exactly as he had suggested.

1 JUDGE HAIRSTON: So he didn't suggest that -- to clarify, you thought he
2 was suggesting it to get it allowed as opposed to he maybe needed the
3 clarification --

4 MR. JENSEN: The Examiner said that if these amendments are entered,
5 then he would withdraw the rejections and allow the claims if there wasn't a
6 further search that yielded any other related reference. Well, there was no
7 other related reference. It was the same reference that we amended to
8 overcome.

9 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Okay. He changed his mind.

10 MR. JENSEN: Exactly. I'm not sure why, but that's what happened.

11 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Okay.

12 MR. JENSEN: The Examiner's final rejection -- you don't see it here. You
13 see sort of the overflow from page 2, but he still concedes that the Holden
14 reference does not teach the limitations that were added by amendment. He
15 takes the rest of page 3 to argue that his understanding suggests that those
16 missing limitations for Holden are rendered obvious through some
17 interpretation of Holden, which we argue is a misinterpretation.
18 His analysis not only misinterprets Holden, but, in our opinion, overlooks
19 the teachings away of Holden from the claimed invention. It also fails to
20 provide an explicit analysis in support of the legal conclusions, which are
21 necessary to require an understanding of the level of ordinary skill in the art.
22 The Examiner also never went into any analysis of the grant factors that
23 include significantly the level of ordinary skill in the art, which would be, in
24 our opinion, quite necessary to uphold any kind of analysis that you see on
25 page 3 to suggest that the missing limitations are somehow suggested or
26 motivated to be filled in with this Holden reference.

1 The Examiner then -- of the two pages in Holden that the Examiner relies on
2 in the final rejection, he refers to language on page 6-4 -- and stop me if
3 you'd like to see any of these references because I can move to the laptop
4 and it's hyperlinked and I can show you what's on 6-4, but as quoted, he's
5 relying on this language: More complex volumes require more time to
6 render, which the reference does state, but it concludes without
7 any further analysis or reasoning or support that this is obvious due to
8 reduction of processed data.

9 Now, the Examiner never explains the level of knowledge possessed by one
10 having ordinary skill in the art and why that person would arrive at the
11 claimed invention just because a reduction of processed data might lead to
12 improved processing time.

13 And again, this is a necessary component, in our opinion, to be able to
14 understand what that person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
15 invention would have understood and perceived in terms of what a reduction
16 in processed data means, and the Examiner's argument is almost akin to
17 saying superconductors aren't patentable simply because reducing resistance
18 leads to improved conductivity.

19 Notably, our claims didn't claim improved or faster processing. They
20 claimed a specific operation of the sampling probe to enable it to be redrawn
21 as it's being moved. Now, the section that the Examiner refers to is called
22 Tumbleview in chapter 6, and as it's described as a fixed volume in space
23 that allows the viewpoint or perspective of the user to change with respect to
24 the same volume.

25 There's nothing that's being redrawn, much less in response to movement of
26 the sampling probe, through the three-D volume from point to point. In

1 other words, the description talks about a whole data set, not a subset of that,
2 in most parts in allowing the viewer's perspective to be changed with respect
3 to the same data set or the same volume of data.

4 Now, it does reference in some parts subsetting that into a subvolume, but,
5 again, the user is looking at the same subvolume, and it's not being redrawn
6 as it's being moved because the user's looking at different perspectives of the
7 same data set, so even if the same volume were rotated instead of changing
8 the perspective of the user, it wouldn't be redrawn as claimed. It would still
9 be looking at the same data set as it's being rotated in the three-D volume.

10 What happens, then, is if you try and convert that into what the limitations
11 require, then you would not be looking at a different perspective of the same
12 data set. You'd be looking at each rotation -- and it's described as tumbling,
13 which means rotating along a particular X, Y, or Z axis.

14 So if you were to change the data set as it moves or rotates around that axis,
15 you'd never see the same data set from a different viewpoint, which is
16 required, and that's why trying to change this feature of Tumbleview
17 into what the claims require would render it inoperable or unsatisfactory for
18 view -- for viewing different perspectives of the same volume.

19 JUDGE SAADAT: Counsel, I have a question.

20 MR. JENSEN: Yes, Your Honor.

21 JUDGE SAADAT: In the repeating step of claim 1, how the data set
22 changes as you're suggesting that --

23 MR. JENSEN: That's a good question.

24 It's hard to perceive without actually having a sample of the software up and
25 running, but I'll try and explain it. There's a large data set of three-D data,

1 typically seismic data. It's subsetted as -- well, it's subsetted by use of the
2 sampling probe.

3 So when the sampling probe enters this three-D volume, the intersection of
4 the sampling probe visible planar surfaces show the seismic data from that
5 three-D volume just on those planar surfaces.

6 When you move the sampling probe from one position to the other, then the
7 data in the three-D volume doesn't change. It's the data that appears on the
8 sampling probe that changes.

9 JUDGE SAADAT: It's like getting different cross sections.

10 MR. JENSEN: Exactly.

11 JUDGE SAADAT: So that's what you're referring to as a new data set when
12 the sampling probe --

13 MR. JENSEN: Well, by operation -- by operation of our invention, yes,
14 that's what's happening when you move the sampling probe from one
15 position or location to another. You have new intersections of the sampling
16 probe within that larger three-D volume data set.

17 Does that address your question?

18 JUDGE SAADAT: It does, but I'm not sure what part of the claim defines
19 that data set versus the data set that changes.

20 MR. JENSEN: Well, if you go back to the claim, this is -- where it's drawn
21 as an image it shows -- it's comprising an intersection of the three-D
22 sampling probe and the three-D volume. As it's being moved in this step,
23 the drawing step is repeated.

24 The movement of the sampling probe from one position to the other is going
25 to place it at a point where the intersection is going to be different than it
26 was before, so by -- inherently, you're going to have different data

1 intersecting the sampling probe from the three-D volume simply by moving
2 it from one position or location to another.

3 JUDGE SAADAT: So that's the -- the three-D -- the redrawn image of the
4 sampling probe is the new data set that changes --

5 MR. JENSEN: Correct.

6 JUDGE SAADAT: -- all the time.

7 MR. JENSEN: Exactly. Well, it's not a new data set in terms of what the
8 three-D volume represents, but it's different in new data compared to where
9 the sampling probe was before.

10 JUDGE SAADAT: As far as the drawing goes.

11 MR. JENSEN: The intersection, right. Exactly.

12 The next section that the -- or chapter in Holden that the Examiner relies on
13 describes GeoSeed on page 8-16. The Examiner erroneously concludes that
14 the claimed sampling probe is equivalent to GeoSeed. In rejecting claim 16
15 in the final office action on page 7, the Examiner admits that a voxel is
16 equivalent to a seed point, which is equivalent to GeoSeed.

17 And that's correct. The Examiner, I don't know how, but misinterprets what
18 the voxel in GeoSeed is doing. It's permitting selecting a seed voxel within
19 a feature of interest and detects other voxels that are adjacent to the seed
20 voxel or any other detected voxel, and then it includes anything that falls
21 within a user-defined range of voxel values.

22 So contrary to the Examiner, the GeoSeed isn't equivalent to the claimed
23 sampling probe, which is a subvolume. The Examiner also concludes that
24 since Holden's disclosure of movement of GeoSeed is always associated
25 with input from a user, drawing is always associated with providing

1 perception to a user and concurrency is always described as sufficiently fast
2 to be perceived as real time, the redrawing steps are equivalent.
3 I have to admit I had to read that probably about 10 times before I could
4 fully appreciate or try and appreciate what it is the Examiner's getting at, and
5 nowhere in GeoSeed did I see any reference to concurrency, sufficiently fast,
6 or real time.
7 Notably, there's no -- there's no specific analysis or reasoning that supports
8 this sort of string of conclusions that the Examiner presents, and one of the
9 things that's significant that's threaded throughout this entire history of
10 prosecution is that the Examiner in these legal conclusions never provides a
11 sufficient or adequate analysis to support them.
12 In KSR, they quote Kahn, a federal circuit case, that rejections on
13 obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements.
14 Instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational
15 underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.
16 And here I think it's clear that he hasn't met that standard, and even giving
17 the Examiner the benefit of the doubt, GeoSeed teaches away from the
18 claimed invention, so even if you were to convert somehow this fixed point
19 representing the voxel into a sampling probe, which is a subvolume, the
20 purpose of GeoSeed would be rendered inoperable simply because the
21 GeoSeed detection algorithm takes these -- a seed point.
22 If I give you an example, the interpreter would take a seed point, say, for
23 example, that lies on a fault represented by the seismic data, and that
24 interpreter wants to see where that fault propagates throughout the larger
25 three-D data set.

1 So he takes that seed. He knows where it is -- he knows that seed lies within
2 a fault, so he knows that now, using this GeoSeed detection algorithm, that
3 mostly likely, when he engages it, he's going to find other voxels that are
4 connected to that one representing the fault, and he can then kind of interpret
5 where the fault path flows.

6 So now, taking GeoSeed and trying to then morph it into a sampling probe
7 that moves throughout the three-D volume would render it inoperable. I
8 mean, you -- what GeoSeed detection algorithm relies on is the fact that
9 you've got these fixed points that don't move. If you moved a voxel from
10 one point to another, we'd never then represent the reflection of that seismic
11 sound reflecting off it at that particular point with that particular data value.

12 The Examiner then moves on in his answer to a chapter that pertains to
13 editing the volume.

14 The -- this particular chapter teaches that the image of the subvolume is
15 redrawn in the rendering window after it is moved, not as it's moved. And I
16 don't know if the Board has a copy of 9-22 at hand.

17 If it doesn't, I can pull it up on the screen for you.

18 JUDGE HAIRSTON: We have it.

19 MR. JENSEN: So as you see, looking at --

20 I'm sorry. 9-21. I think 9-21. The description as its operation is on 9-22, but
21 9-21 shows you the user interface. You've got two slider bars. The user
22 selects an axis that they want to edit along, X, Y, or Z. The slider bar
23 basically edits the volume in that right window, and it -- one slider
24 will edit it from one side of the plane.

25 The other slider edits from the other side of the plane, and through this
26 process, an interpreter or user can then edit the size of that subvolume within

1 the larger three-D volume data set. Significantly, though, that editing
2 doesn't occur in the rendering window, which is the left window, until the
3 slider bars are released.

4 Now, if you were to take that subvolume and move it from one point in that
5 three-D data set to another point, you'd have to edit each one of those planar
6 surfaces along the X, Y, and Z axis using the slider bars, and you'd have to
7 move it from one point to another.

8 So that basically you would take one plane that shows in the right window,
9 move it to that other position, size it, take another plane, move it to that, size
10 it, and then the final axis, move it to that plane, and size it, and then you'd
11 have a new, basically, subvolume at a different location in the three-D data
12 set showing the intersection.

13 The Examiner never explains or supports why redrawing the Holden
14 subvolume in this manner in the rendering window, which is the left
15 window, after it's moved is equivalent to rendering the claimed sampling
16 probe as it is moved, and contrary to the Examiner's answer on page 11,
17 Applicants never concurred that the claim phrase -- the three-D sampling
18 probe moves through the three-D volume -- is a change in the shape, size, or
19 location of the three-D probe within the three-D volume.

20 The Appellant's Brief on page 18 refers to paragraph 52 of the application
21 which describes a change in the shape, size, or location of the sampling
22 probe within the three-D volume. So movement of the subvolume within the
23 three-D volume is not the same as movement of the sampling probe through
24 the three-D volume to another location.

25 These are different limitations in the same claim that further distinguish the
26 Holden editing features in chapter 9 from the claimed invention.

1 There are other dependent claims that I think the Examiner overlooked that
2 discuss reshaping the sampling probe, like in claim 2, or reorienting the
3 sampling probe, like in claim 5, and the distinction is further highlighted by
4 the description. These steps -- these are additional steps in the dependent
5 claims apart from the movement through the three-D volume, which is from
6 location to location.

7 The significant disadvantage here from Holden's operation is that if you take
8 Holden and you want to move it from point A to point B in the three-D
9 volume and then back to point A, all that the interpreter is going to see is
10 with the intersection at point A and point B and then back at point A.

11 There's never going to be any intuitive response to see what's going on
12 between points A and B and back between B and A.

13 With the claimed invention, the user intuitively sees everything that
14 happens, as the probe, sampling probe, is being redrawn between points A
15 and B and then back between B to A, so if there was a fault, for example,
16 that the interpreter was trying to track using Holden's subvolume in this
17 chapter, he would have to know basically through an educated guess that it
18 starts here.

19 Then he would have to make another guess that maybe it moves over here,
20 and then if that's wrong, he has to guess again and keep doing this through
21 the process of elimination to find exactly where the path of that fault
22 propagates through the three-D volume data set.

23 With the claimed invention, the user simply moves it in the direction that
24 they think, and if it's not in one direction, they can immediately move to
25 another direction and see the data change and pick up a fault intuitively
26 along that path that it propagates.

1 The other advantage is that the user might pick up on another feature of
2 interest, for example, a salt bill (phonetic), that might intersect that fault and
3 just perchance using Holden's technique, might stumble on it just by
4 guessing at point B that there's some other feature of interest.
5 So this invention is a significant improvement over the prior art because it
6 really enables an efficient -- an increased -- significantly increased
7 efficiency level of using a subvolume to track features of interest in real time
8 through the three-D data set and provide intuitive responses to an interpreter.
9 The Examiner then falls back on chapter 5, which I think is probably the
10 furthest removed from what's going on with the claimed invention.
11 This chapter describes parameter settings. The parameters that it refers to
12 are described as opacity, contrast, or color, for example.
13 Now, in our application, we also talk about these, but not necessarily in
14 terms of parameters, but as, I think, attributes or characteristics.
15 So back to the data value that the voxel includes, for example, amplitude.
16 This data value of amplitude will have, depending on the reflection strength,
17 some range of values between zero and maybe 256. The representation of
18 that change compared to a voxel, say, sitting next to it with a different
19 reflection magnitude is represented in a number of ways. One of them could
20 be the color.
21 So you might have a change in color depending on the magnitude of the data
22 value or a change in contrast or opacity. So these are things that are related
23 to the seismic data, but they're not necessarily -- well, they're not anywhere
24 equivalent to a sampling probe. So the adjusting of these parameters simply
25 don't or aren't equivalent to the sampling probe and how it moves throughout
26 this three-D volume data set.

1 The adjusting of the rendering parameters is also subject to the same
2 limitations or restrictions as the editing feature that we talked about with
3 respect to chapter 9. So if you look at page 5-9 of Holden, I think depicts a
4 representation of the parameter editing features.
5 And there's also a slider bar and there's also a window for the numerical
6 value.
7 So you can take the slider bar, move it, and see the numerical value of the --
8 of the data value changing for that parameter between zero and say 256.
9 And then when you let go of the slider bar -- this is the same as chapter 9 --
10 then it renders the changed parameter, but, again, the significant difference
11 is their parameter isn't a sampling probe.
12 And the Holden reference -- the Examiner goes into this double buffer
13 feature which is simply taking the rendering step, the drawing, and doing it
14 all at once in the
15 background, so that then when you move or adjust the parameter by moving
16 the slider bar, you can see that changing as you move it, but there's no
17 redrawing.
18 The drawing step has already been done in the background all at once before
19 you move the slider bar so that it's -- and I think it's described in chapter 5 as
20 sort of an animation technique, so all of the rendering of the drawing has to
21 be done in the background before you go through and try and analyze the
22 data used in this adjustment.
23 JUDGE SAADAT: Okay. Another question. If the sliding bar is not
24 touched, what would be rendered?
25 MR. JENSEN: Nothing. There's no activity in either this chapter 5 or
26 chapter 9 editing the subvolume unless you move the slider bar. I mean, I

1 guess there's a default that probably pulls up the subvolume at a
2 predetermined location within the three-D volume and you see that.

3 JUDGE SAADAT: So a slide bar has a range, let's say zero to 50.

4 MR. JENSEN: Right.

5 JUDGE SAADAT: Or the number you mentioned. At zero -- that's a
6 setting -- what would be displayed?

7 MR. JENSEN: Well, are you talking about this chapter or chapter 9?

8 JUDGE SAADAT: Chapter 9.

9 MR. JENSEN: Chapter 9.

10 JUDGE SAADAT: Yes.

11 MR. JENSEN: Okay. Well, the slider bar, if you recall, in chapter 9 adjusts
12 the sides of the plane in either the X, Y, or Z axis. So if one slider is set to
13 zero, I suspect that's going to represent one extreme of the plane.

14 JUDGE SAADAT: Right. So some type of cross section would be
15 displayed, so I'm not convinced that the sliding bar is really relevant to
16 displaying some image that is selected based on the sampling probe.

17 MR. JENSEN: Well, I --

18 JUDGE SAADAT: It just adjusts the way that that image could be modified
19 or a particular aspect of it.

20 MR. JENSEN: Well, that's -- that's our position. Somehow the Examiner
21 has gotten caught up that that's somehow equivalent or suggests moving the
22 subvolume from one location to another and showing the intersection
23 changes as it's being moved from one location to another, but that's not
24 what's happening with the movement of the slider bar in chapter 9, as I think
25 that you've just suggested.

1 It's an editing feature that, for primary purposes, resizes the subvolume, but
2 it could be used to move it from one location to another, but, like I said or
3 described earlier, you would have to -- you would have to take the slider bar,
4 pick an axis, choose the size of the subvolume in the new location, and then
5 go through that process iteratively through the three planes.

6 And it's not going to even render until you're through with that whole
7 process, so you'll never see what's happening in between that first location
8 and the next location. Does that help?

9 JUDGE SAADAT: It does. And also, why claim 1 doesn't have the term
10 real time? What's the difference? There is a difference. I'd like to know
11 your explanation.

12 MR. JENSEN: If I may go back to the exemplary claim.

13 Well, the thinking at the time was to follow what the Examiner's suggestion
14 was. He made the proposal of these two alternatives because their different
15 sets of claims include one limitation or the other as you see highlighted.

16 And aside from thinking that we had an agreement that would satisfy the
17 Examiner and we would overcome this reference, I think all I can say for the
18 record is that they include different -- different degrees of being able to see
19 the sampling probe move through the three-D volume.

20 One may not be exactly in real time, but is being redrawn as its being
21 moved. So I think the common denominator is that it's being redrawn as its
22 being moved.

23 Are there any further questions?

24 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Any other questions?

25 JUDGE SAADAT: I don't have any.

1 MR. JENSEN: In conclusion, the Examiner admits that Holden doesn't
2 teach the limitations that were added during the agreement. Tumbleview
3 and the GeoSeed features not only fail to provide the motivation to modify
4 Holden, but they also teach away from the limitations, and the rest of Holden
5 relied on by the examiner is neither equivalent to those limitations nor
6 sufficient to prove the obviousness by a preponderance of the evidence.
7 The Applicants respectfully request that you reverse the Examiner's rejection
8 of claims 1 through 52.

9 JUDGE HAIRSTON: Okay. Thank you, counsel.

10 Whereupon, the proceedings at 9:39 a.m. were concluded.
11
12
13